

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-9 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6 and 7 are amended and claim 10 is cancelled.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Fischer to Applicant's representative during the October 19, 2004 personal interview. The personal interview is summarized below and thus constitutes Applicant's record of the interview.

An Election of Species was required between the Figures. Accordingly, Applicant elected Species I, Figs. 1, 3, 4, and 5 and Species A, Fig. 2. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 9 read on the elected species. Applicants also continue to retain claims 6-8, and respectfully request rejoinder of claims 6-8 should claim 1 be found allowable because claim 1 remains generic to claims 6-8.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to remove the objectionable language. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 6-191238 (JP'238) in view of Ueyoko, U.S. Patent No. 5,885,387. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully traversed this rejection in the March 22, 2004 filed Request for Reconsideration and thus respectfully retains those arguments. Applicants herein address the additional arguments presented in the outstanding Office Action.

As admitted on page 4 of the Office Action, JP'238 is completely silent with respect to the use of a single, continuous cord. Ueyoko disclose a substantially continuous cord 15. However, Ueyoko fails to disclose two bead cores that are arranged adjacent to each other in a widthwise direction of the tire. Ueyoko only discloses two bead cores that are arranged adjacent to each other in the radial direction of the tire (Figs. 9-11).

The Office Action then asserts that the motivation to combine JP'238 with Ueyoko is that the carcass structure in Ueyoko increases bead durability and contributes to the reduction of tire weight, both of which are desirable in all tires, and further asserts that only expected results would be achieved in modifying the carcass structure of JP'238 in view of Ueyoko. The Office Action thus concludes by stating that it would have been obvious to form the carcass structure of JP'238 from a single, continuous cord structure, in view of Ueyoko. This is not correct and represents hindsight reconstruction.

Both JP'238 and Ueyoko suffer deficiencies as identified in Applicant's description of the related art. JP'238 suffers deficiencies as identified on page 1, lines 15-21 of Applicant's specification. It is neither taught nor suggested in JP'238 to provide a continuous cord successively repeating a roundtrip. Ueyoko also suffers deficiencies as identified on pages 2 and 3 of Applicant's description of the related art. Ueyoko corresponds to JP-A-9-155991. In particular, Ueyoko suffers deficiencies in that the bead portion is not sufficiently stiff and hence the pulling out phenomenon of the carcass ply cord exists. A problem thus exists in that the durability of the bead portion is lacking. As such, unexpected results are obtained by the features of claim 1, because claim 1 overcomes the deficiencies of both JP'238 and Ueyoko. Neither JP'238 nor Ueyoko suggests that the claim 1 combination would achieve the advantages associated with the claim 1 combination.

Moreover, both JP'238 and Ueyoko are assigned to the same assignee, namely Sumitomo Rubber Industries, Ltd., Ueyoko issued on March 23, 1999 and JP'238 was published on July 12, 1994. Therefore, Ueyoko should have known full well the disclosure of JP'238, and yet failed to disclose that the bead cores of JP'238 could be used with the Ueyoko structure.

Although increased bead durability and a contribution to tire weight reduction is desirable, there is nothing disclosed in JP'238 or Ueyoko to suggest the construction of claim

1 in order to provide an increase in bead durability over JP'238 and Ueyoko. JP'238 fails to disclose or suggest a continuous cord, and Ueyoko fails to disclose or suggest the bead cores of claim 1. As argued during the personal interview, a continuous cord may be disclosed in Ueyoko as well as other references. However, the use of a continuous cord is not disclosed in JP'238 or the environment provided by JP'238. Claim 1 can not be used as a template in order to select features from JP'238 and Ueyoko.

In view of the foregoing, neither JP '238 nor Ueyoko discloses or suggests all of the features recited in claim 1, or the additional features recited in claims 2 and 9. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 5016620 (JP'620) in view of EP 0583615 (EP '615) and also in view of Ueyoko and Pouilloux, U.S. Patent No. 3,815,652. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, none of the applied references disclose or suggest a pneumatic radial tire wherein a continuous cord successively repeats round trip between two bead cores of at least one bead portion as recited in claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte  
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/sxb

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: October 22, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--